

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**ERIC HUNTER,**

CASE NO. 1:21 CV 561

Petitioner,

v.

JUDGE JAMES R. KNEPP II

**WARDEN DAVID W. GRAY,**

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge James E. Grimes Jr.’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) to dismiss Petitioner Eric Hunter’s Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. 14). Specifically, Judge Grimes recommends the Court dismiss all three grounds of the Petition as procedurally defaulted. *See id.* at 12-26.

Under the relevant statute:

Within fourteen days of being served with a copy [of a Magistrate Judge’s R&R], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file timely written objections to a Magistrate Judge’s R&R constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review by the district court of any issues covered in the R&R. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 814-15 (6th Cir. 1984); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

In this case, the R&R was issued on November 28, 2023, and it is now January 8, 2024. Petitioner has neither filed objections nor requested an extension of time to file them. Despite the lack of objections, the Court has reviewed Judge Grimes’s R&R, and agrees with the findings and

recommended rulings therein. Therefore, the Court ADOPTS Judge Grimes's R&R (Doc. 14) as the Order of this Court, and DISMISSES Petitioner's Petition (Doc. 4) as set forth therein.

The Court finds an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). Further, because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right directly related to his conviction or custody, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); FED. R. APP. P. 22(b); Rule 11 of Rules Governing § 2254 Cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James R. Knepp II  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE